



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/544,036

04/06/2000

Catherine Lin-Hendel

LH001

7503

35070 7590 04/02/2007
ANATOLY S. WEISER
3525 DEL MAR HEIGHTS ROAD, #295
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

2 MONTHS

04/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

MAR 30 2007

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/544,036
Filing Date: April 06, 2000
Appellant(s): LIN-HENDEL, CATHERINE.

Anatoly S. Weiser
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/06/06 appealing from the Office
action mailed 06/02/06.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Art Unit: 2179

6,211,874	Himmel et al.	04/2001
6,313,854	Gibson	11/2001
6,215,490	Kaply	04/2001
6,208,770	Gilman et al.	03/2001
6,360,205	Iyengar et al.	03/2002
5,793,365	Tang et al.	08/1998
5,966,122	Itoh	10/1999
6,330,575	Moore et al.	12/2001
6,188,398	Collins-Rector et al.	02/13/2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 12-24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 48, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al. [US. 6,211,874] in view of Gibson [US. 6,313,854].

As per independent claims 1, 27 and 48, Himmel teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for selecting and simultaneously displaying a plurality of digitally stored objects comprising the steps/means:

means for displaying digitally stored objects via a webpage (fig. 5A);

means for enabling a user using input device to select on said webpage a plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects each displayed digitally stored object having at least one dynamically linked associated destination object (Hypertext link of fig. 5A; col. 6, lines 61-67); and

means for enabling the user to submit the plurality of selected objects for processing (col. 7, lines 26-29);

means for retrieving the at least one dynamically linked destination object for each selected one of the plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects together from a storage medium and then simultaneously displaying together the retrieved destination objects for viewing (fig. 5C; col. 7, lines 26-29 and col. 7, lines 46-67 through col. 8, lines 1-36).

Himmel fail to clearly disclose the plurality of stored objects displayed within a single window (although Himmel teaches the plurality of stored objects displayed within a single display). Gibson discloses a plurality of stored window objects 112a, 112b and 112c displayed within a single window 114 (fig. 6; col. 8, lines 6-43). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the

invention to use the teaching from Gibson of displaying a plurality of stored window objects displayed within a single window since users can more effectively manipulate and manage the viewable area of the browser while preserving the advantages of frames.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches means for sub-framing information associated with the selected plurality of digitally stored objects (fig. 5C; col. 7, lines 26-29).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, it is inherent in the Himmel's system that if data in the sub-framed windows (fig. 5C) exceed the sub-framed windows, a horizontal dynamic scroll bar and a vertical dynamic scroll bar that allow an orderly arrangement and presentation of textual information would be presented.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches the selection means being adapted to select each selected displayed digitally stored object of the selected plurality of displayed digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of displayed digitally stored objects and, after all of the selected plurality of displayed digitally stored objects have been selected, single clicking a computer mouse button (from col. 6, lines 61-67 through col. 7 line 1); and double clicking the computer mouse button retrieving together and simultaneously displays together the associated destination objects (col. 7, lines 6-11 and from col. 6, lines 61-67 through col. 7, line 1 and col. 7, lines 7-8);

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Himmel teaches each one of the different associated link-tokens being a first color and each time one of the plurality of digitally stored objects is selected by single clicking the computer mouse button, the first color changes to a second color to indicate the selection of the digitally stored object (col. 7, lines 20-25).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, according to Himmel's web-based system, it is inherent that each one of the selected link-tokens would change to a different (third) color when a browser returns to a list of the plurality of digitally stored objects (fig. 5A) from the retrieved and simultaneously displayed associated destination objects (fig. 5C) to indicate that they have been visited.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, Himmel teaches single clicking on the selected link-token de-selecting the link-token so that the link-token reverts to the first color indicating the de-selection of the link-token (col. 7, lines 3-5 and lines 20-25).

As per claims 16, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches means for selecting the plurality of digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to and clicking on a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and clicking the first computer mouse button while holding down the unique control key sequence (from col. 6, lines 65-67 through col. 7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 13; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claims 18, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches the selection means being employed and the retrieval means being invoked using a computer mouse having a first button and a second button (one of the mouse buttons; from col. 6, lines 61-67 through col. 7, line 1 and col. 7, lines 7-8), the plurality of digitally stored objects being selected one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and clicking the first (from col. 6, lines 65-67 through col. 7, lines 1-3), and then after all of the plurality of digitally stored objects have been selected, clicking the second computer mouse button to retrieve and simultaneously display the associated destination objects (col. 7, lines 6-11).

As per claims 19 and 20, which are both dependent on claim 18, Himmel teaches the first one of the retrieved associated destination objects simultaneously displayed for viewing being made larger than the other simultaneously displayed destination objects by using a computer input device to invoke the first destination object, and when the computer input device being used to invoke a second one of the retrieved associated destination objects simultaneously displayed for viewing, the first destination object returns to the same smaller size of the other simultaneously displayed destination objects and the second destination object is made larger than the other simultaneously displayed destination objects. As indicated by fig. 5C, when the user invokes

the first linked web browser by clicking on it, it is made larger than the rest of the linked web browsers, and when the users invoke on the second linked web browser, the first one is returned to the smaller size of the other linked web browsers and the second linked web browser is made larger than the rest of the linked web browsers.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 18, it is a similar scope to claims 13 and 14, therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches the system being used on a personal computer (fig. 3).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches the system is used with a computer network (fig. 3 and fig. 4).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches the system being used on a CD ROM (fig. 3 and fig. 4).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent that Himmel's system would be implemented using software.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 12; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, Himmel teaches primarily textual content associated with each one of the retrieved associated objects is sub-framed (fig. 5C).

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, Himmel in view of Gibson teaches each object of the plurality of retrieved linked destination being

Art Unit: 2179

displayed in a separate sub-frame within the single window (e.g., Gibson; fig. 6; each stored window objects 112a, 112b, 112c is displayed in a separate sub-frame 112a, 112b, 112c within the single window 114).

Claims 2-5, 32-34 and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and further in view of Kaply [US 6,215,490].

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel does not disclose means for providing a two-dimensional array of graphical thumbnails of the digitally stored objects. Kaply discloses that in fig. 5A. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of means for providing a two-dimensional array of graphical thumbnails of the digitally stored objects in Himmel's system since graphical thumbnails would give more of a hint (information) than plain texts and two-dimensional array would accommodate a large number of the digitally stored objects.

As per claims 3, 4, and 5, which are all dependent on claim 2, Kaply's fig. 5A inherently indicates that the graphical thumbnails in the two-dimensional array can be selectively scrolled at any one of the plurality of speeds, can be selectively stopped from scrolling, and can be selectively scrolled vertically and horizontally.

As per independent claim 32, Himmel teaches a Web electronic document page displaying simultaneously together a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays (col. 7, lines 18-29 and col. 7, lines 46-67 through col. 8, lines 1-36). It is inherent in Himmel's system that each sub-framed array is independently and selectively stopped and scrolled at a selective speed by a viewer (using the scrollbar control.)

Himmel does not disclose the plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays displayed within a single electronic webpage. Gibson discloses a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays 112a, 112b and 112c displayed within a single electronic webpage 114 fig. 6; col. 8, lines 6-43). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Gibson of displaying a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays displayed within a single electronic webpage since users can more effectively manipulate and manage the viewable area of the browser while preserving the advantages of frames.

The modified Himmel does not disclose each sub-framed array containing a frame containing a plurality of thumbnails and a plurality of independently selectable sub-frames. Kaply discloses a plurality of sub-framed windows containing scrolling arrays, each sub-framed array containing a plurality of thumbnails and a plurality of independently selectable sub-frames (fig. 5A). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of including a plurality of thumbnails in each of the sub-

framed arrays in modified Himmel's system since the thumbnails would give more of a hint (information) than plain texts.

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose when a page loads for a first time a default category selected by a website operator is displayed, and when the page loads for a time other than the first time, a category corresponding to the category last viewed by the viewer when they accessed the page is displayed. It is inherent in Himmel's web-based system that when a multi-frame web page is loaded for the first time, the default category frame is loaded and when the page is loaded for a time other than the first time, by hitting the back button, a category corresponding to the category last viewed by the viewer when they accessed the page is displayed.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose each sub-framed array includes a progress bar indicating how much of the total array has been viewed, the bar also indicating the beginning and end of the sub-frame array. Kaply discloses the two vertical and horizontal scrollbars with the progress bars 160 in fig. 4. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of including a progress bar in each sub-frame array indicating how much of the total array has been viewed and indicating the beginning and end of the sub-frame array in the modified Himmel's system since it would help the users to know where they are in the arrays of the thumbnails.

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose when a viewer removes a cursor from a thumbnail; the sub-frame array in which the thumbnail resides resumes scrolling. Kaply's system in fig. 58 implies that when the viewer removes the cursor from a thumbnail in order to scroll the scrollbar, the array in which the thumbnail resides resumes scrolling. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply of removing a cursor from a thumbnail, the sub-frame array in which the thumbnail resides resumes scrolling since the array would reveal to the viewer more available thumbnails.

As per claims 41, 42, and 43, which are all dependent on claim 32, it is inherent in Himmel's window system that the position of the thumbnail relative to the sub-frame array is selectively controllable by the viewer or a website operator; the enlarged image of the thumbnail can be selectively programmed to remain on-screen, be minimized or pushed to the background; the page can display any desired number of sub-frame arrays of interest, the sub-frame arrays able to be manually or automatically extended beyond the screen, scrolled horizontally and vertically, or resized so that all of the sub-frames are viewable.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Gilman et al. [US. 6,208,770].

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Himmel does not disclose the two-dimensional array of graphical thumbnails having a selectively adjustable number of columns and rows. Gilman discloses that in fig. 6, col. 5, lines 57-59. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Gilman of the two-dimensional array of graphical thumbnails has a selectively adjustable number of columns and rows in the modified Himmel's system since it would adjust the number of graphical thumbnails to fit on the screen, and it would give a better arrangement of the thumbnails on the screen by the users.

Claims 9-11 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and further in view of Iyengar et al. [US, 6,360,205].

As per claims 9, 10 and 11, which are all dependent on claim 1, Himmel teaches the selection means including a different link-token associated with each one of the plurality of digitally stored objects (fig. 5A), each one of the plurality of displayed digitally stored objects adapted to be selected one at a time by using a computer input device to select, and de-select, a different link-token such that they are visually highlighted, and back to normal in case of de-selecting, for the user (fig. 5A, 5B; from col. 6, lines 61-67 through col. 7, lines 1-5 and col. 7, lines 18-21), a button (multi-link button 115 of fig. 5A) being

invoked to retrieve together and simultaneously display together the associated destination objects (col. 7, lines 6-11 and lines 25-29, and col. 7, lines 46-67 through col. 8, lines 1-36). Himmel does not disclose the selection means include a different check box associated with each one of the plurality of digitally stored objects, each one of the plurality of digitally stored and presented objects being selected one at a time by using a computer input device to select, and de-select, a different check box such that a check appears, and disappears in case of de-selecting, in the check box. Iyengar discloses that in fig. 8. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use checkbox selecting and de-selecting in place of Himmel's link selecting since checkbox method is well known and widely used when selecting multiple objects on web pages.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and further in view of Appellant's admitted prior art.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 1, Himmel does not disclose the system being used on a wireless device. This feature is taught by Appellant's admitted prior art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the

invention to include the wireless capability in Himmel's system since it would have provided the flexibility and portable to the system.

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, Himmel teaches selecting each one of the plurality of digitally stored objects one at a time by pointing to a different link-token associated with each different one of the plurality of digitally stored objects and clicking the first computer mouse button while holding down the unique control key sequence (from col. 6, lines 65-67 through col. 7, lines 1-3). He does not disclose clicking the first computer mouse button while holding down the second computer mouse button. This feature is taught by Appellant's admitted prior art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the selecting technique of clicking the first computer mouse button while holding down the second computer mouse button in Himmel's selecting technique since both techniques are considered equivalent.

Then after all of the plurality of digitally stored objects have been selected, clicking the first computer mouse button without holding the second computer mouse button to retrieve and simultaneously display the associated destination objects (col. 7, lines 6-11).

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Gavron et al.

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose when a viewer moves a cursor to a thumbnail of interest, the sub-frame array stops rolling and high level information regarding the thumbnail appears in a dialog box positioned approximate to the thumbnail of interest. Kaply's system in fig. 4 implies that when the users do not scroll the array and move the cursor to a thumbnail of interest, the array stops rolling. Gavron discloses that in his figures in steps 3 and 5 page 105. When the user moves a mouse over a window thumbnail icon, information associated with that icon pop up in a dialog box that positioned approximate to that icon. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Kaply and Gavron of moving a cursor to a thumbnail of interest, the sub-frame array stops rolling and high level information regarding the thumbnail appears in a dialog box positioned approximate to the thumbnail of interest in modified Himmel's system since the dialog box associated with the interested thumbnail would give brief information about the thumbnail quickly.

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Tang et al [US. 5,793,365].

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose selecting a thumbnail of interest results in a larger image of the

thumbnail appearing with more detailed information in a sub-frame that the viewer can scroll manually or that can be automatically scrolled. Tang discloses when selecting on the interested thumbnail 26 of fig. 5, the larger image of thumbnail appeared with more detailed information and the viewer can scroll that sub-frame by the scrollbar (fig. 6). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Tang of selecting a thumbnail of interest results in a larger image of the thumbnail appearing with more detailed information in a sub-frame that the viewer can scroll manually or that can be automatically scrolled in modified Himmel's system since the sub-frame would give more detailed information associated with the selected thumbnail, and at the same time it would occupy only a small window estate.

Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Itoh [US. 5,966,122].

As per claims 37 and 38, which are dependent on claim 32 and 37 respectively, modified Himmel does not disclose when a viewer selects a thumbnail of interest, a border surrounding the thumbnail being highlighted wherein a color of the highlighted border changes to indicate that the image has been selected and viewed. Itoh discloses that in col. 11, lines 14-19. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching

from Itoh of coloring the highlighted thumbnail border in modified Himmel's system since it would clearly identify the selected thumbnail.

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 38, modified Himmel does not disclose after viewing the thumbnail the viewer being not interested in the selected thumbnail, the viewer can close the image and the color of the highlighted border changes or disappears to indicate that the thumbnail was viewed but of no further interest to the viewer. Itoh discloses the border of the selected thumbnail being highlight in color (col. 11, lines 14-19. He does not specifically disclose, but his system implies that after the viewer closes the image, the color of the highlighted border changes or disappears to indicate that the thumbnail was viewed but of no further interest to the viewer. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Itoh of closing the image causing the color of the highlighted border changes or disappears in modified Himmel's system since it would inform the viewer that the thumbnail is no longer selected.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Moore et al. [US. 6,330,575].

As per claim 44, which is dependent on claim 32, Himmel's system of sub-frame arrays windows (in fig. 5C) inherently indicates that they could be

selected and enlarged. Modified Himmel does not disclose the sub-frames can include transactional commands to process a commercial transaction. Moore discloses that in (fig. 15). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Moore of including transactional commands to process a commercial transaction since it would allow the user to process the commercial transaction immediately after viewing an interested thumbnail.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Collins-Rector et al. [US. 6,188,398].

As per claim 45, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose the thumbnails display advertising. Collins-Rector discloses that in fig. 2. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Collins-Rector of displaying advertising in the thumbnails in modified Himmel's system since it would cause attention from the users.

Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson and Kaply and further in view of Appellant's admitted prior art.

As per claim 46, which is dependent on claim 32, modified Himmel does not disclose the webpage including at least one textual link and at least one graphical link, each link representing a different category of information. The application prior art cited in fig. 3A of shows that user could link to different categories by clicking on textual link "Antiques" and graphical link "Sell your Item". It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching of including at least one textual link and at least one graphical link, each link representing a different category of information in modified Himmel's system since it would vary the presentation of the pages and make the pages more interesting to the viewers.

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Gibson, Kaply and Appellant's admitted prior art and further in view of Iyengar.

As per claim 47, which is dependent on claim 46, the modified Himmel does not disclose the webpage including at least one control element for controlling the textual and graphical links. Iyengar discloses multiple control elements for controlling the different flight links in fig. 8. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Iyengar of including at least one control element for controlling the textual and graphical links in

modified Himmel's system to give the user more criteria to filter out the linked pages.

(10) Response to Argument

The Himmel's reference discloses:

Himmel, at column 3, lines 30-64, shows a method of accessing accessing interrelated files on a computer system and the computer files are presented in the form of pages having links, such as hypertext links, which facilitate loading of related pages.

Himmel further shows simplifying selection of multiple of hypertext links in a given page. The foregoing objects are achieved in a method of accessing files located in a computer system, generally comprising the steps of **creating a browser window on a display of the computer system, selecting a plurality of embedded links (such as hypertext links) from at least one page displayed in the browser window, and processing the plurality of embedded links concurrently.** The embedded links may include at least two embedded links from a single page displayed in the browser window. A graphical pointer may be used to select the embedded links. In one implementation, a pop-up menu is displayed once the links have all been selected, wherein the pop-up menu has a plurality of menu items associated with different types of link processing. For example, the processing step may include: the step of **concurrently displaying pages** associated with the plurality of embedded links in a plurality of respective browser windows on the

display; the step of concurrently printing pages associated with the plurality of embedded links using a printing device of the computer system; or the step of concurrently downloading pages associated with the plurality of embedded links, to a storage device of the computer system. Selection of the links may be facilitated by allowing the user to switch to a multi-link selection mode.

The Gibson's reference discloses:

Gibson, at column 4, line 45 through column 5, line 6, shows a method of accessing an electronic page on a computer system, generally comprising the steps of ascertaining that the electronic page is adapted to be displayed as a single window containing a plurality of frames (having fixed attributes), displaying a plurality of windows on a display device of the computer system, wherein each window corresponds to a respective one of the frames, and enabling one or more window operations for each of the windows, such as the operations of individually resizing, minimizing, maximizing, and closing each of the windows.

The windowed frames can be displayed as child windows within a parent window on the display device, or in separate parent windows. The frame windowing mode can be toggled between active and inactive states. Initial attributes of the windows can be based on the frame attributes of the respective frames. These attributes can be ascertained by interpreting tags in a main computer file associated with the electronic page.

Appellant has argued the following points:

1) The previous filed two declarations under 37 C.F.R. 1. 131 show that in 1996 and 1997, the inventor was in possession of an embodiment of the invention capable of performing the basic inventive concept commensurate with the scope of independent claims 1 and 27. The declarations recite specific facts and include contemporaneously created notes and printout exhibits created from contemporaneous code. It appears, that Appellant's explanations of reduction to practice made in the three Rule 131 Declarations have not been considered.

2) Motivation to combine Himmel and Gibson references is lacking.

3) Gibson does not teach display in a single window of object associated with selected objects.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

1) Both Declarations and Exhibits 12/18/03 and 09/30/04 under 37 CFR 1.131 have been considered but is ineffective to overcome the applied references.

a) Appellant seeks to establish prior invention by showing reduction to practice before 05/15/98 the date of the Himmel's reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Himmel reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is

Art Unit: 2179

more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*. 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). In Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 filed 09/30/2004, second paragraph, claimed "to put together a variety of mock-up data and programs in the same computer to demonstrate the base premise of the concept"; however, this concept was only implemented on a single (or local) computer in 1996 and the Appellant did not know how to make the concept work from network to network and from website to website until 1999. Therefore, it raises the question whether or not the Appellant has a conception before 1999.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the reference, see MPEP 715. The Exhibits 1-3 comprise the webpage template of draft code as well as sample display format for the display of all objects and related items. They are, individually or together, still not evidence that provide a showing of facts in character and weight. Therefore, the evidence is still insufficient to establish a "reduction to practice" of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the reference.

b) In general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose. (See *MPEP* 715.07)

For an actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose, but it need not be in a commercially satisfactory stage of development. If a device is so simple, and its purpose and efficacy so obvious, construction alone is sufficient to demonstrate workability. *King Instrument Corp. v. Otari Corp.*, 767 F.2d 853, 860, 226 USPQ 402, 407 (Fed. Cir. 1985). (See *MPEP* 2138.05).

The evidence submitted is also insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Himmel reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The affidavit fails to establish an alleged reduction to practice prior to the application filing date. There is no evidence provided by the Appellant in the critical period which is the time between the time just prior to the filing date of the Himmel reference to the filing date of this application. *MPEP* 2138.06 states that "the critical period for diligence for a first conceiver but second reducer begins not at the time of conception of the first conceiver but just prior to the entry in the field of the party who was first to reduce to practice and continues until the first conceiver reduces to practice", and "an Appellant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required".

In determining the sufficiency of a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, diligence needs not to be considered unless conception of the invention prior to the effective date is clearly established, since diligence comes into question only after prior conception is established. Ex parte Kantor, 177 USPQ 455 (Bd. App. 1958)

However, in the interest of compact prosecution, the examiner notes that the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the effective date of the Himmel reference (05/15/1998) to the US filing date of this application (04/19/1999) because of periods of lacking activity in the Exhibit 1 without any explanation such as periods of 2 months between May 14, 1998 and July 15, 1998; 5 weeks between July 15, 1998 and August 24, 1998; 5 weeks between August 24, 1998 and October 2, 1998; 6 weeks between October 2, 1998 and November 15, 1998; 2 months between November 15, 1998 and January 20, 1999; and 4 weeks between January 20, 1999 and February 25, 1999.

c) There is not enough evidence to clearly prove the relationships between Declaration, Exhibits 1-3 and the claims. Therefore, no reduction to practice has been shown and Appellant has failed to establish prior invention.

The declaration and accompanying exhibits do not provide enough evidence to support all the claimed limitations prior to the reference date, therefore do not support conception of the claimed invention. For example, there is not

explanation of the exhibits or positive statement on the declaration to support the limitation "simultaneously displaying together in a single window the retrieved destination objects for viewing" in claims 1 and 27. Furthermore, there is not explanation of the exhibits or positive statement on the declaration to support the limitations "a single electronic webpage", "a plurality of scrolling sub-framed arrays" and "each sub-framed array able to be independently and selectively stopped and scrolled at a selective speed by a viewer or website operation" in claim 32. The aforementioned limitation in claims 1, 27 and 32 merely provides as example of insufficient evidence supporting conception of the claimed invention. It is to be understood that there are other claimed limitations that are not sufficiently supported by the evidence provided by the declaration and the accompany exhibits.

2) There is motivation to combine Himmel and Gibson references. They both disclose a big single window containing multiple objects. While Himmel reference teaches plurality browser windows (Himmel, figure 5C, window 114a, window 114b, window 114c) being contained in the parent window (figure 5C, parent window 110), Gibson teaches a single window containing a plurality of frames and the windowed frames can be displayed as child windows (Gibson, figure 7, Child Window 1, Childe Window 3) within a parent window (figure 7, 114) on the display device. Both Himmel and Gibson teach a single Internet webpage window contains HTML files and hypertext links. They both disclose a

big single window containing multiple objects. The motivation would have been to provide users more effectively manipulate and manage the viewable area of the browser while preserving the advantages of frames.

3) Gibson teaches the feature of "displaying in a single window of object associated with selected objects". Himmel teaches displaying digitally stored objects via a webpage (Himmel, figure 5A, displaying stored object Hypertext link 1, stored object Hypertext link 2, stored object Hypertext link 3, stored object Hypertext link 4 and stored object Hypertext link 5 via the Web Browser (30));

Himmel also teaches selecting on the webpage a plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects, each displayed digitally stored object having at least one dynamically linked associated destination object (Himmel, figure 5B, Hypertext links 112a, 112b, 112c are highlighted for selecting); means for retrieving the at least one dynamically linked destination object for each selected one of the plurality of the displayed digitally stored objects together from a storage medium and then simultaneously displaying together in a single window the retrieved destination objects for viewing (Himmel, figure 5C, all the hypertext links are displayed on single web browser window). Appellant's attention is directed to column 3, lines 40-65 that cites "the steps of creating a browser window on a display of the computer system, selecting a plurality of embedded links (such as hypertext links) from at least one page displayed in the browser window, and

Art Unit: 2179

processing the plurality of embedded links concurrently...For example, the processing step may include: the step of concurrently displaying pages associated with the plurality of embedded links in a plurality of respective browser windows on the display...".

It is clearly that each selected hypertext link of the plurality of hypertext links is retrieved and simultaneously display on the same window.

However, Himmel fails to clearly disclose the feature of "the plurality of stored objects displayed within a single window for viewing". Gibson teaches a plurality of stored window objects 112a, 112b and 112c being displayed within a single window 114 (Gibson, figure 6).

Therefore, the combination of Himmel and Gibson teach all the limitations of claims 1, 27, 48 and 32

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Mylinh Tran

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mylinh Tran', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Art Unit: 2179

Lynne Browne

Appeal Panel Member



**Lynne H. Browne
Appeal Specialist, TQAS
Technology Center 2100**

Weilun Lo

SPE. AU 2179



**WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**